

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

LANEAU, RONALD

 APPLICATION NO.
 FILING DATE
 FIRST NAMED INVENTOR
 ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
 CONFIRMATION NO.

 09/865,371
 05/25/2001
 Earl Walter Emerick
 ROC920010109US1
 3728

 46797
 7590
 12/01/2006
 EXAMINER

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3714

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| C.      |
|---------|
| M       |
| $U_{I}$ |

## **Advisory Action**

| Application No. | Applicant(s)   |
|-----------------|----------------|
| 09/865,371      | EMERICK ET AL. |
| Examiner        | Art Unit       |
| Ronald Laneau   | 3714           |

| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief  |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
|   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |  |  |  |
|   | Ronald Laneau   | 3714   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence add  | ress   |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>26 October 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A  | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR  | R ALLOWANCE.   |  |  |  |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: |   |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7  | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).         | g date of the final rejecti<br>E FIRST REPLY WAS F                               | on.<br>ILED WITHIN   |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL   | tension and the corresponding amount<br>shortened statutory period for reply orig<br>r than three months after the mailing da<br>). | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi te of the final rejection, o | ate extension fee<br>ce action; or (2) as<br>even if timely filed, |  |  |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,   |   |  | ecause   |  |  |
| <ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> </ul>  |   |  |  |  |  |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  |   |  |  |  |  |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).   |   | ected claims.  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.  | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co   | mpliant Amendment  | (PTOL-324).  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   |   | timely filed amendme   | ent canceling the  |  |  |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .   | ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will vided below or appended.  | ll be entered and an e   | explanation of   |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-46</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .   |   |  |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.                            |   |  |  |  |  |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but   |   | •  |  |  |  |
| See Continuation Sheet.   |   | r condition for allowar  | ice pecause.   |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>Other:</li> </ol>  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   | _ ^  |  |  |  |
|   |   | Konald Spre  | ser  |  |  |
|   |   | Ronald Laneau Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3714                                    | 11/29/06   |  |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been found unpersuasive, the Examiner maintains that the final action was proper.

RL